

Furthering Reimagine
Using Equity and Current Implementation Plans in Minnesota to Improve the Roadmap

Capstone Paper

In Partial Fulfillment of the Master Degree Requirements
The Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs
The University of Minnesota

Sarah Abe
Matthew Berg
Denetrick Powers

May 1st, 2018

Faculty Supervisors
Dr. Laura Bloomberg
Dr. Keith Mayes

Client
Minnesota Education Equity Partnership (MnEEP)
Represented by Jennifer Godinez and Carlos Mariani

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN MINNESOTA.....	3
REIMAGINE MINNESOTA.....	4
METHODOLOGY OF POLICY BRIEF ANALYSIS	5
CRITICAL RACE THEORY & CULTURAL POLITICS.....	5
EQUITY IN EDUCATION.....	6
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	6
CURRENT STATE OF EQUITY	8
SEGREGATION AND CURRENT INTEGRATION POLICIES IN MINNESOTA.....	8
MINNESOTA’S INCREASING SEGREGATION	8
AMSD’S REIMAGINE AND MINNESOTA’S ACHIEVEMENT AND INTEGRATION PLAN	9
SHARED THEMES	10
ANALYSIS OF A&I PLANS FOR FOUR MAJOR DISTRICTS	11
DEFINING A&I DISTRICT GOALS	13
A&I INTERVENTIONS.....	14
A&I BUDGETS & FUNDING.....	15
A&I PLAN CHANGES IN 2018	15
CONCLUSION.....	16
FINAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.....	16
REFINING REIMAGINE	16
IMPLEMENTING REIMAGINE	17
ADDITIONAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS IN EDUCATION & BEYOND.....	18
FURTHER RESEARCH.....	19
CONCLUSION.....	20
APPENDIX A	21
APPENDIX B.....	22
REFERENCES.....	24

Introduction

Educational equity and gaps in achievement between students of color and white students continue to be a problem for Minnesota school districts. Following the 2015 case of *Cruz-Guzman v. State of Minnesota*, the Association of Metropolitan School Districts convened to develop a strategy to address issues of integration, access, opportunity, and educational achievement. The result, Reimagine Minnesota, outlines categories and strategies in congruence with the Minnesota Department of Education's Achievement and Integration program and World's Best Workforce bill, passed in 2013. This analysis uses a Critical Race Theory lens to explore the historical impact of segregation on education, compares the strategies of Reimagine Minnesota to the Achievement and Integration plans of four Twin Cities metropolitan area school districts, identifies recommendations to move Reimagine forward based on an historical context and the analysis of the state's Achievement and Integration plans, and challenges stakeholder framings of equity and strategies of intervention for students of color. Results suggest that broad and ambiguous strategies to address issues of education equity continue to perpetuate a recurring cycle of students of color being left behind.

This brief will

- Briefly explain the context and background of this project
- Examine historical effects and particularly the role of the courts in segregation and equity
- Summarize the history of segregation within Minnesota
- Compare State Achievement and Integration plans with the Reimagine Minnesota roadmap
- Analyze the trajectory of current State integration policies on narrowing the achievement gap
- Develop policy recommendations for Reimagine as it moves towards implementation
- Explore critical questions around plans that aim to address issues of education equity

Student Achievement in Minnesota

Minnesota has long been recognized for its strong educational system. In 2015, USA Today ranked Minnesota as the 10th best state for education, citing its 88 percent graduation rate and relatively high proficiency rates on national 8th grade reading and writing tests (Frohlich). However, a closer look at educational attainment in the state shows a staggering achievement gap (sometimes called an opportunity gap) along the lines of race and poverty. In 2016 there was an 18 percentage-point difference between the graduation rate of white students and students of color. Sixty-five percent of black students graduated in 2016, and the rate is even lower for American Indian students at 52.6 percent (Raghavendran & Dupuy, 2017). Educational disparities such as these are consistently demonstrated in districts across the state and have gained national attention over the past 30 years.

Efforts have been made to narrow the gap and there has been some success. From 2012 to 2013, the graduation rate for black students rose almost six percentage points - five times the progress made by white students (McGuire, 2014). In 2016, graduation rates for black students at Minnesota high schools rose 3 percentage points (Raghavendran & Dupuy, 2017). Vast resources have been spent to narrow the gap and proposals to expand spending continue to be introduced (Magan 2017). Beyond this, tens of organizations in Minnesota continue to work with the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) to decrease educational disparities. Despite these modest gains, Minnesota retains one of the highest achievement gaps in the country (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2009).

Increasing segregation across the state has also stymied efforts to decrease the gap. As schools become more segregated, those with the greatest percentage of people of color are the same schools that tend to have the lowest test scores (Lonetree & Webster, 2017). In 2015, seven families and one nonprofit organization directly targeted this disparity and filed a suit against the state of Minnesota for denying minority children their constitutionally guaranteed right to an adequate education, a failing which they linked to rising school segregation (Verges, 2015). This case, and other recent legislative actions, prompted further efforts to decrease segregation and thereby increase the educational achievement of all students.

Reimagine Minnesota

Reimagine Minnesota is an effort spearheaded by the Association of Metropolitan School Districts (AMSD). It defines its purpose as “a commitment to create lasting equity and excellence in education for all students” and to “ensure the constitutionally guaranteed right to an adequate education of all students by creating a comprehensive collective action plan to address integration, access, opportunity, and educational achievement” (Association of Metropolitan School Districts [AMSD], 2017). The Reimagine Roadmap was strategically developed using multiple methods with a wide scope of input. From March to December of 2016, district leaders came together to form an ad-hoc committee in order to address “integration, access, opportunity, and educational excellence for all students.” From January to May of 2017, the committee engaged “broad based conversations to identify shared goals” and heard from more than 2,000 people. The participants identified educational goals, clarified the need to create specific action priorities, analyzed key barriers to success, and out of this process developed the Reimagine Roadmap.

The specific strategies outlined during the process make up three broad categories: 1) teaching and teachers, 2) student and family support, and 3) system funding and leadership. Each of these broad categories is made up of specific strategies. The larger goals of the roadmap are to “See All, Serve All, and Support All.” See All is defined as “effective, diverse stakeholders who use trusting relationships to create welcoming classrooms, schools and communities that meet the needs (hope & dreams) of all students and families.” Serve All is defined as “personalized relevant education for all students that guarantees access to rigorous learning and eliminating predictability based on race.” Support All is defined as “equitable resources (time, talent, funds)

aligned to student needs (hopes & dreams) that enable every district to ‘see all’ and ‘serve all’” (AMSD, 2017). As we will explore later, these strategies, as well as the goals of Reimagine, serve as a strong foundation to tackle the opportunity gaps that exist within our educational system. Positioning it within a context of segregation within the United States, and Minnesota specifically, is critical to highlight its importance as well as how best to implement it in the present climate.

Methodology of Policy Brief Analysis

The analysis in this policy brief relies upon a number of tools, including a literature review, interviews with stakeholders, and quantitative analysis techniques. A thorough literature review using journal and newspaper articles on segregation and equity around Minnesota, and particularly the Twin Cities, was used to frame the historical context of segregation and inform the remaining analyses on current efforts to close the achievement gap.

Information on AMSD’s Reimagine Roadmap and Minnesota’s Achievement and Integration (A&I) plans was collected via published resources on the Minnesota Department of Education’s (MDE) website. Additional clarifying information was provided via direct communication from the A&I staff identified as primary contacts in each A&I report. Further discussions with MDE staff were utilized to inform the analysis and shape the final recommendations. Quantitative analysis techniques were used to categorize the main purposes of A&I interventions and compare those interventions with the strategies identified in the Reimagine Roadmap. The categories of each intervention were identified by each district within their plan, and all achievement data is self-reported by the school districts to MDE. SMART goals and key indicators of progress (KIPs), used interchangeably by the districts as progress indicators, are similarly not differentiated in this brief.

Critical Race Theory & Cultural Politics

This analysis also utilizes Critical Race Theory (CRT) to frame the cultural politics of segregation and integration policies. Researchers and policy makers identify socio-economic differences and racial disproportionality as effects of policy. Rarely, however, do they view cultural-ideology as a variable of policy formulation and implementation informing the scholarly and public imagination of what is deemed “good” or “effective” policy, or what should be considered the “fair” or “effective” distribution of educational resources (Dumas, Dixon, & Mayorga, 2015). A Critical Race Theory lens identifies the cultural politics and framework in which strategies and policies such as Reimagine and World’s Best Workforce are formed. Critically questioning their assumption of being “effective” for students of color is central to CRT and to understanding the current educational landscape.

Critical Race Theory, not understood as an abstract set of ideas but by a number of defining elements, is an oppositional and dynamic form of legal scholarship that evolved during the 1980’s (Taylor, 2006). The first element is that racism is normal and the assumptions of white superiority are ingrained in political, legal and educational structures that are almost

unrecognizable. The second element is narrative, which Critical Race Theory calls racial reality, to make visible the realities of people of color. The third element is historical context, used to conceptually ground issues in a specific historical background. The importance of context is the understanding that there is widespread historical illiteracy that reveals the ignorance of America's racist past, specifically in education. Fourth is the theory of interest convergence, which puts that Blacks have gained racial equality only when their interests have converged with those of powerful whites. Finally, CRT reminds us that racism is likely permanent, due to the fact that backlash and resistance have followed periods of seeming progress as society tries to reassert the power of the dominant majority.

Throughout the history of educational equity and policy, disproportionate numbers of students of color falling behind white students have led many advocates to question the integrity of reform efforts. Believing that there are deeper historical, sociological and cultural ideologies that drive the decisions of policy makers, the majority of whom have been white, scholars developed Critical Race Theory to identify defining elements of racism. Using this lens to define elements of segregation and integration provides an analysis of how history, sociology and culture work together to hinder or move forward social justice efforts towards providing equitable education for all.

Equity in Education

Critical Race Theory requires that we assess the current state of equity in education in light of historical factors. This section explores the historical background of segregation, considers how this context has impacted educational inequities, and examines the impact of court decisions on the quality of education over time. It ends with a brief section on how history impacts the current state of interventions aiming to promote student achievement and educational equity. The definition of equity used throughout this analysis is provided by the National Education Association and states that equity is "just and fair inclusion. An equitable society is one in which all can participate and prosper. The goals of equity must be to create conditions that allow all to reach their full potential. In short, equity creates a path from hope to change" (2018).

Historical Background

At the center of educational inequity has stood the issue of segregation since the beginning of court cases regarding disproportionate outcomes. Court decisions regarding inequitable educational outcomes have often been ambiguous when it comes to enforcing policies to address the issue at hand. Understanding the doctrine of judicial decisions is crucial to the development of policies and interventions enforced by state, federal and court mandates. In the 2015 *Cruz-Guzman v. State of Minnesota* case, seven parents and guardians filed a suit in Hennepin County district court accusing state officials of enabling school segregation in the Twin Cities metro area. The case eventually made its way to the Minnesota court of appeals, which dismissed the case, stating that the question of "adequate" education is a political question

and not justiciable. By reviewing the role that courts have played in school segregation cases we can analyze the ways in which courts have made it difficult for policies to be enforced at the constitutional level as well as analyze the ways in which courts inform or enforce the cultural politics of education policy.

Before getting into the history of segregation court cases regarding educational outcomes, we have to remind the reader that it was the *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) case which enforced the notion that White Superiority required the separation of the dominant white race and inferior races (Thompson Dorsey, 2013). This legal precedent laid the foundation for disproportionate outcomes in social, educational, and economic resources for over a half century. Not until *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1954) did courts decide that it was unconstitutional to racially segregate schools. It was not until one year later, during the second case of *Brown v. Board of Education* (1955), that the Supreme Court demanded that desegregation happen at a deliberate speed. Though the *Brown v. Board of Education* (1955) case offered a glimpse of hope towards achieving equitable education, much resistance from southern schools followed soon after.

Following the *Brown v. Board* case came the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which gave Title VI of the Act the ability to use legislative power, to investigate further into school segregation, and to implement enforcement policies that allowed the federal government to hold back funds from districts that unlawfully discriminated against students of color (Title VI, 1964). In the *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County* (1968) decision, the Supreme Court established 6 key areas (composition of the student body, faculty, staff, transportation system, extracurricular activities, and facilities) which should be examined to determine if a school district eliminated its system of segregation (Thompson Dorsey, 2013). These cases give us a glimpse into what the power of the judiciary system could achieve if it were to be explicit in the decisions it makes regarding education policy.

Following these cases came a slew of others that led to more ambiguous decisions. These in turn led to questions of what it meant for a school to be segregated and who had the authority to make decisions around segregation. Not giving a good working definition of what “good faith” meant, the Supreme Court in the *Board of Education of Oklahoma City v. Dowell* (1991) and *Freeman v. Pitts* (1991) cases decided that a school district could achieve unitary status if “(a) the vestiges of past discrimination has been eliminated to the extent practicable, and (b) whether the school district acted in good faith fully and satisfactorily in complying with and committing to its desegregation plan as to not return to its former ways” (Thompson Dorsey, 2013). Consequently, the decisions of the *Board of Education* and *Freeman* cases gave way to relaxed legal standards in totally eliminating segregation, allowing schools to re-segregate. What might have led to more confusion and ambiguity to court decision making is the decision of the *Capacchione et al. v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools et al.* (1999). In this decision the courts decided that the opinion of the Associate Superintendent of Charlotte-Mecklenburg was unconvincing although they expressed concern of the court's decision to dismantle their desegregation plan.

The district court concluded that Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools acted in good faith to remedy its violation of de jure segregation and this decision was later affirmed in 2001 in the decision of *Belk et al. v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (2001). Two years following that court decision, the district of Charlotte-Mecklenburg experienced higher rates of re-segregation than before (Thompson Dorsey, 2013). It is possible that these contradictory court decisions could have stemmed from the trend of emphasizing excellence through closing the achievement gap rather than desegregation efforts.

The beginning of the 70's marked the first case where a court ruled that segregated schools that are not the result of intentional state discretion are acceptable. In 1983, the publication, "A Nation at Risk" argued that U.S. schools were mediocre, influencing state and federal policy makers to retreat from desegregation policies and focus instead on school performance (Scott & Quinn, 2014). Since that time there has been an increase in attempts to raise the bar for course requirements, content, and improving teacher education programs.

Current State of Equity

Current integration policies increasingly put an emphasis on school performance and excellence with an increase in market-based reforms, including policies such as school choice, vouchers, competitiveness, and incentives (Scott & Quinn, 2014). These types of reforms have increased in Minnesota, and according to multiple legal scholars such as Myron Orfield, have increasingly segregated school districts. Many interventions in the Twin City metro area school districts use strategies such as school choice. With ambitious goals of decreasing gaps in MCA reading and math scores, there are still groups of students who are lagging behind and/or have seen an increase in achievement gaps. The following sections will explore reasons for the lingering educational disparities and make recommendations for new programs moving forward.

Segregation and Current Integration Policies in Minnesota

This section will briefly discuss the history of segregation in Minnesota and the state's recent Achievement and Integration (A&I) program. It will explore how the interventions utilized in the A&I program compare with the strategies identified by the Reimagine Roadmap. It will then analyze the A&I plans of four large districts, all of which are AMSD members, and evaluate their progress in an attempt to determine the areas of initial success for the A&I program.

Minnesota's Increasing Segregation

Efforts to address the race-based disparities in Minnesota have risen due to rapid demographic changes resulting in increased segregation and a larger achievement gap (Orfield, 2015). Minnesota has long contained a diversity of jobs, steady economic growth, and a high standard of education. The Twin Cities metropolitan area is a hotbed of progressive politics which reinforce the idea of opportunity for all and has been a leader in integration and civil

rights. However, the Twin Cities' level of racial disparities has rapidly diverged from other regions of similar size and demographics, and currently the achievement gap in the Twin Cities metro is one of the widest in the country (NCES, 2009). Since the start of the 21st Century the number of severely segregated schools has increased seven-fold and the population of segregated, high poverty neighborhoods has tripled (Orfield, 2015). In similar cities, such as Portland and Seattle, disparities have declined. There are features which contribute to this disparity and to the inability for integration to be a reality, but two contribute overwhelmingly: 1) the poverty housing industry (PHI), and 2) the poverty education complex (PEC) (Orfield, 2015). These two industries have produced a series of policies which have perpetuated existing segregation and inequities (Appendix A).

The effect of these policies has been tremendous. They have reversed the progress toward integration and have created greater disparities in educational outcomes. For instance, the concerted effort to achieve integration by location subsidized housing in the suburbs has been stalled completely and the central cities share of subsidized housing is higher than at any point since the 1960s (Orfield, 2015). Only 15 percent of subsidized housing is in locations that are less than 30 percent nonwhite. In the absence of countervailing pressures in the public and private sector, real progress in residential and educational integration is possible. This is just one example of a series of policy and procedural decisions which have led to the segregation and disparities in the Twin Cities area. The complex web of policies by public, nonprofit and private actors during the past 30 years are intermingled in a number of policy areas - housing, financing, transportation, and education. Our state has been led down this path by housing developers, school reformers, and the proliferation of organizations and groups with a firm financial interest in maintaining segregated living patterns.

The rise of the poverty housing industry in the early 1990's was accompanied by a parallel movement in education policy. As neighborhoods resegregated, so did schools. Enhancing school integration efforts was the initial argument made in support of open enrollment and charter schools. Unfortunately, these policies had the reverse effect and reasserted and were shaped into strategies similarly used to evade *Brown v. Board of Education* mandates. One political assist was the "sharply changed interpretation" of the equal protection clause in the late 1990's by the Minnesota Attorney General's office. The decision outlined that without proof of discriminatory conduct, the integration plan was illegal because it discriminated against whites. After the effective destruction of the integration rule, school segregation skyrocketed, which, in turn, accelerated housing segregation. As the PHI and PEC became more influential, the Met Council stopped enforcing Policy 39. Meanwhile, Minneapolis's schools went from 34% nonwhite to 59% non-white in just 12 years (Orfield, 2015).

AMSD's Reimagine and Minnesota's Achievement and Integration Plan

Out of this landscape have come several recent, large-scale efforts aimed at addressing the achievement gap, believed to be caused in part by the increasing segregation of the Twin Cities and Minnesota as a whole. The state Achievement and Integration plan pairs lower

educational achievement with segregation and mandates that districts address both issues simultaneously. The Reimagine Roadmap takes a broader, systems-level approach to student achievement, but does not explicitly address segregation. However, considering the historical impact of segregation on equity, we can still utilize lessons from the A&I plans to shed light on how Reimagine could be implemented.

In 2013, new state legislation allowed districts to use funds that had previously been allocated to racial desegregation to be used for wider purposes such as integration and efforts to improve academic achievement. To manage this funding, MDE created the A&I program aiming to “pursue racial and economic integration, increase student achievement, create equitable educational opportunities, and reduce academic disparities based on students' diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds in Minnesota public schools” (Achievement and Integration for Minnesota, 2013). At the same time the World’s Best Workforce (WBWF) bill was introduced, mandating that school districts prepare students for college and strive to close achievement gaps (World’s Best Workforce [WBWF], 2013). The A&I program requires school districts to submit 3-year plans to MDE detailing their broad goals to increase overall student achievement and narrow the racial gap as well as the specific interventions that will be used to accomplish those goals. The plans must align with the state’s WBWF requirements, and progress towards both plans is expected to be reported at the same annual, public meeting for each district. The details of the A&I legislation were developed primarily with consultation from high-level professionals including administrators, educational experts, and researchers.

Following the 2015 *Cruz-Guzman v. State of Minnesota* court case referenced above and in the midst of developing A&I implementation throughout the state, AMSD launched the Reimagine initiative. Reimagine Minnesota is another attempt to increase integration, access, opportunity, and educational achievement. Using an in-depth process that incorporated feedback from parents, students, administrators, and more, the Reimagine Roadmap was created to unite AMSD school districts in moving towards educational equity. Both plans follow the same broad themes, so while Reimagine Minnesota is a framework still in its beginning stages and the A&I program has moved into its second phase of implementation, lessons from the A&I process can shed light on next steps for Reimagine.

Shared Themes

Reimagine and A&I are remarkably similar in their approach and use similar ideas to advance educational equity. Both place a high focus on improving student achievement and both lay out similar strategies or activities to accomplish their aims. Throughout both is a focus on teacher development and training, a need for culturally appropriate services and curriculum, the desire to bridge the gaps between schools and families, and goals of increasing student opportunity and support. Major differences arise in two places: first, A&I has many interventions around school choice as a means to decrease segregation while this is absent from the Reimagine Roadmap; and second, Reimagine includes a category for systemic and funding interventions to create change, while the A&I plans have a surprising lack of specific systemic interventions.

Referring back to Critical Race Theory framing, Reimagine’s recognition of necessary changes to political, legal, and educational structures is essential to moving beyond the gap. Reimagine’s roadmap is more comprehensive and holistic, perhaps arising from the different voices that were involved in shaping each plan; high-level experts were instrumental in forming A&I while Reimagine utilized a broader inclusion of youth and teachers. However, both plans lack the element of narrative, or racial reality, that is recognized by CRT and would explicitly identify race and make visible the realities of people of color.

Despite their differences, the bulk of the interventions occurring through A&I planning align well with Reimagine’s strategies (Figure 1). It is heartening to see that multiple levels of interventions across the state are reaching the same conclusions about how to increase student achievement and decrease the gap. Unfortunately, as of yet there is little evidence to show the success or failure of these programs (see next section). In order for Reimagine to move to the next level and effectively combat educational inequities, it needs more data, more research, and more clarity about which programs work.

Figure 1

A&I Intervention Categories (# of interventions)	Reimagine Strategies
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaching and teachers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Professional development, including cultural training (9) b. Recruitment & retention of staff of color (3) 2. Student and family support <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. College readiness, including elevating student leadership (5) b. Cultural responsiveness, including interdistrict activities (4) c. Family engagement (3) 3. System funding and leadership (0) 4. School choice (9) 5. Other (1) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teaching and teachers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop & sustain cultural competence b. Prioritize and ensure personalized education c. Develop & implement inclusive standards d. Develop retention & recruitment of staff of color 2. Student and family support <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Elevate student voice and leadership b. Eliminate disproportionality c. Build bridges between schools and community 3. System funding and leadership <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Create and sustain understanding of equity b. Statewide funding that ensures equity & access

Analysis of A&I Plans for Four Major Districts

The A&I plans have been in place since 2014, following the legislation mandating their creation in 2013. As their interventions align so closely with the Reimagine Roadmap and have

been in place for several years, we analyzed their progress in an attempt to clarify the future effectiveness of Reimagine. Unfortunately, the beginning stages of the A&I plans lack the clarity necessary to identify successful strategies for narrowing the achievement gap and increasing students' academic performance.

The following is an analysis of the A&I plans for four major districts: Anoka-Hennepin, Minneapolis Public Schools, Rosemount – Apple Valley – Eagan, and Saint Paul Public Schools. These districts are all fairly large, but they represent a mix of demographic qualities and trends. All districts are members of AMSD, the coalition responsible for creating the Reimagine Roadmap.

According to the Anoka-Hennepin School District (2018), this district is the largest in Minnesota with 38,764 students and 248,000 residents spread out across 172 square miles and 13 suburban communities north of Minneapolis and Saint Paul. This school district is a key example of how communities, and specifically their demographics, are changing. In 2005, 83 percent of its students were White; in 2017, that number had fallen to 70 percent. The African American student population grew from 6.69 percent to 13.61 percent over that time period, while Asian and Hispanic students grew as well. We can expect that trend to continue and the educational opportunities and outcomes for the rapidly growing population will need to be addressed. The mean household income for Anoka-Hennepin School District residents was \$87,023 (Census Bureau, 2010). In terms of student achievement, graduation rates were slightly above the statewide rate at 83.2 percent. Only 14.8 percent, 17.6 percent, and 14.1 percent did not meet the math, reading, and science standards (Minnesota Department of Education [MDE], 2018).

Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) is the third largest school district in the state with 36,357 students and 413,651 residents spread out over the 58.4 square miles of Minneapolis (Minneapolis Public Schools [MPS], 2018). Minneapolis is a crucial example of how the Twin Cities metro has become more segregated, and likewise the disparities getting worse, over the last 20-30 years. The mean income of those residents living in Minneapolis has steadily grown and was marked at \$73,231 in 2016 (City of Minneapolis, 2018). The economic demographics compared to the mean income is stark for this district. In 2018, 21.6 percent of students were categorized as English Learners, 17.1 percent as in need of special education, 3.4 percent as homeless, and a staggering 59.8 percent on free/reduced lunch (MDE, 2018). The student racial demographics are also fascinating with 17.1 percent Hispanic/Latino, 36.2 percent Black/African American, and 34.2 percent White (MDE, 2018). When compared to the 2010 census, the demographics differences are striking. In 2010, Minneapolis was 63.8 percent white, 18.6 percent Black/African American, and 10.5 percent Hispanic/Latino (Census Bureau, 2010). In terms of student achievement, 66 percent graduated, 39.1 percent did not meet math standards, 39.6 percent did not meet reading standards, and 46.3 did not meet science standards in 2017 (MDE, 2018).

Rosemount – Apple Valley – Eagan (RAVE) has 28,802 students spread over 108 square miles in the southern suburbs of St. Paul and Minneapolis (MDE, 2018). This district is relatively wealthy with a median household income approximately 1.4 times higher than the rest of the

state at \$91,652 and only 4.7 percent of the population below the poverty line (Census Bureau, 2016). The overall population is 81 percent White, and though there is a high margin for error, the Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Asian populations are estimated at 5, 5, and 6 percent respectively. The graduation rates for this district have hovered around 90 percent for the past five years, slightly higher than the state average. Student proficiency rates are also higher than average, with approximately 67 percent of students testing proficient in math, science and reading in 2017. The racial demographics of the school district itself differ from the overall area demographics. In 2018, White students were 64.1 percent of the school population, with Black/African American students making up 11.6 percent, Hispanic/Latino students at 9.3 percent, and Asian students making up 8.5 percent of the population (MDE, 2018).

MDE identifies Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) as the second largest school district in Minnesota, composed of 37,297 students over 56 square miles. While the district itself is quite diverse, it is also marked by high rates of poverty. In 2018, the median household income in the district is \$46,386 (half that of RAVE) and a full 67.9 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced lunch. In that same year, 20.8 percent of students were White, 26.9 percent Black/African American, 14 percent Hispanic/Latino, and 31.7 percent Asian. Graduation rates steadily increased from 73.1 percent in 2013 to 76.9 percent in 2017. The percent of students who tested proficient in math has decreased by 7 percent in the past 5 years and in 2017 fell to 35.2 percent. Reading and science proficiency have not seen the same trend, with reading hovering at approximately 38 percent since 2013 and science proficiency rising from 27.7 percent in 2013 to 32.4 percent in 2017. Progress is steady in SPPS, but the high rates of poverty coupled with large numbers of English Learners (30.9%) create high barriers to student success that are not faced by other districts (MDE, 2018).

Defining A&I District Goals

The A&I plans from the four districts above paint a picture of the efforts underway to reduce the achievement gap around the Twin Cities. Each district A&I plan identifies specific goals of increasing the percentage of students proficient in Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment (MCA) scores and decreasing the proficiency gap between white students and students of color (for example, Anoka- Hennepin aims to reduce the MCA reading proficiency gap between students of color and white students by 7.8% between 2014 and 2017). The plans also identify a broad goal of integration, yet this is rarely quantified or tied to any specific measure of progress. Within the broad achievement and integration goals, each district also identifies activities that it believes will accomplish them. The activities are remarkably similar across districts and typically fall into broad categories such as professional development, college readiness, and school choice (see Figure 1 above). Each activity is categorized by the school district and measured by a Key Indicator of Progress (KIP) that is reported on annually. While the activities are similar across districts, their categorizations, descriptions, and KIPs differ widely, making it almost impossible to identify which activities are effective. The ability of school districts to develop their own plans is a strength, but also negatively impacts MDE's

ability to evaluate statewide success. Additionally, the lack of standardization makes it difficult to perform a cross-plan analysis beyond broad trends.

It is clear, however, that MCA proficiency goals were overly ambitious for the first three-year implementation of the A&I program and have thus largely been unmet by every school district. The next section explores in further detail the activities used to reach the MCA achievement and district integration goals and broad trends across the four districts analyzed.

A&I Interventions

The district A&I plans contain a wide range of activities, or interventions, each tracked with individualized key indicators of progress (KIPs) (see Appendix B for a full list of activities and their KIPs for each district). The top three priorities are, in this order: 1) professional development opportunities, including training in cultural responsiveness for teachers and administrators, 2) student support in the form of college and career readiness activities, and 3) promoting school choice. Each plan from all four districts included some aspect of each of these categories.

Because each district defines its own KIPs, however, the same interventions can be evaluated in multiple ways, none of which may have any bearing on whether or not the program is effective in increasing MCA proficiency scores. For example, providing professional development opportunities for teachers by training them in cultural competence is included in each plan. However, each district measures success in a different way, from teacher ratings (Anoka-Hennepin) to impact surveys (MPS) to teacher/administrative participation in training (RAVE and SPPS). While a school district may report that this training program is successful because it has met its defined KIP, it may be impossible to tell from that KIP if the program is effective in reducing achievement disparities.

There can also sometimes be a disconnect between the KIP and the activity that it is meant to evaluate. The SPPS A&I plan includes a self-identity program called “Lovin’ the Skin I’m In” meant to promote confidence, well-being, and achievement among students. The KIP for this activity is the overall improvement of the district’s MCA reading scores. While this link can make sense, it takes connecting several dots to reach this point. In the absence of a more direct evaluation method, it is extremely difficult to know how this program defines success and whether or not it is proving effective.

Measuring the success of each intervention is further complicated by the sheer number of activities connected to each MCA proficiency goal. One goal can contain up to 8 specific activities. Even if progress towards the overall goal were achieved, it would not be clear which program were contributing to this success. The compounding confusion of the KIPs as discussed above results in very little clarity about which activities are contributing to achievement and educational equity.

Structural support for these activities is also lacking. The A&I plans contain a number of interventions targeted at individual behavior, but very little in the way of larger systemic change. Individual interventions may not lead to the improvement of any structural concerns - for

example, while professional development stemming to cultural competence is an important subject, the reality is that high turnover rates can make it very difficult for individual training to make a larger impact. Current KIPs make it difficult to ascertain whether or not the trainings taking place across districts are proving effective in increasing student achievement and narrowing the gap. Larger issues with the A&I goals include a lack of connection to the demographic shifts or specific issues within each district, a missing understanding of the historical and root causes of disparities, and an avoidance of overtly discussing issues of race, all of which are essential components to progress according to Critical Race Theory. The tremendous complexity of the problem, the interplay of all these issues, and the absence of clearer evaluation measures make it essentially impossible to know which of the interventions used in the A&I plans are the cause of the modest progress that has been made towards narrowing the achievement gap in recent years.

A&I Budgets & Funding

Budgets for the A&I plans are clearly laid out by MDE and must follow a formula that is submitted every year for review. Expenditure totals follow an 80/20/10 breakdown with direct services not exceeding 80 percent, professional development not exceeding 20 percent, and administrative costs not exceeding 10 percent. For districts not meeting their goals, the commissioner must use up to 20 percent of the district's A&I budget to implement improvement plans. One aspect to note is that payments to other districts or to vendors for contracted services are included in the direct student services, professional development, or administrative/indirect costs sections depending upon the services being purchased. Another piece to clarify is that English language learners program or special education specific services are not included as well as adult basic education (MDE, 2018). The districts that we have highlighted have followed the criteria specified by the state. However, these points should be understood more deeply.

A&I Plan Changes in 2018

It is important to weigh the 2014-2017 A&I plans against those developed for the 2017-2020 school years. What is different? How have the plans changed? Very little. While there are differences, they are minor in comparison. The key indicators are similarly developed. The overall goals are similar. The biggest difference is the amount of improvement that is needed to meet those goals. MDE has been providing coaching and working with the school districts in order to create more achievable benchmarks. One MDE representative mentioned that while they have several recommended improvements, they believe the goals are much more achievable with the provided support. However, the interviewee also mentioned that they would like to see improvements to the overall goals of the plans, how the data is aggregated, the KIPs, and how integration is approached within these plans.

Conclusion

Statewide achievement scores have seen some improvement (MDE, 2018), but the structure and evaluation process for the A&I program make it unclear which aspects of the overall strategy are most successful. Assessing the evaluative weaknesses of the A&I plans reveals valuable information about how the Reimagine Roadmap can be implemented. The next section will utilize the lessons gleaned from the A&I program analysis to make recommendations about how to effectively implement Reimagine.

Final Policy Recommendations

The full scope of this work is an aim to impact the policy arena by understanding the current policies as well as the cultural-ideology and history of segregation within Minnesota and the United States. By analyzing the context in which current plans at addressing achievement have emerged and the trajectory of what is or is not working in current legislation, we can refine the Reimagine Roadmap and develop its ability to be implemented effectively in order to promote the constitutional right of all students to receive an “adequate” education. Reimagine is an exciting tool which must be taken in context and continually refined to contain the most responsive policies and strategies to create effective change. These specific recommendations aim to refine, implement, and develop both school districts’ and the state’s ability to help students achieve, both by building upon the framework of Reimagine and by making broader policy recommendations for the field.

Refining Reimagine

- **Refine Reimagine through the lens of Critical Race Theory:** It is paramount that we develop organizations that are multicultural in leadership and development. Within multicultural organizations there is an inclusion of people from diverse backgrounds integrated across all levels of the organization, its policies, and systems. One tangible reality of this is using a framework that examines society and culture as they relate to categories of race, law, and power. Critical Race Theory incorporates this framework and recognizes the importance of systems in structuring our environment, shaping our daily practices, and promoting equity. The necessity to realize narrative, history, and restructure power in order to promote all people’s movement forward is clear. Reimagine does a great job of establishing a new tool to tackle educational equity, but utilizing CRT would allow the Roadmap to further explore the root of racial disparities.
- **Deepen the commitment of Reimagine through the framework of access, participation, representation, and outcomes as foundational questions:** One of the key elements that we heard in our interviews with educational leaders was the need to focus on the above framework in order to address systemic problems. The framework was established in the A&I plans, but our analysis suggests some disconnect between the A&I framework and its implementation. Yet developing strategic persistence, or long-term strategies that are

sustainable throughout organizational change, is crucial. Reimagine also contains elements of “integration, access, opportunity, and educational excellence,” and maintaining these foundational concerns throughout the development of Reimagine will allow a deeper strategic clarity and establish a more specific direction to address inequities within school districts to promote educational outcomes for all students.

- **Define and create specific direction for the strategies within schools and school districts:** Specificity around Reimagine strategies is critical. Though our analysis suggests that there are certain elements which will make a difference in the outcomes of all students, it is important to consider how those strategies will come to fruition. For instance, “building bridges between school and community” is an important element, but it is unclear how this will be developed. It will be important to work with district leaders to develop an implementation plan. We further suggest clarifying best practices amongst the school districts, including more research into community-specific interventions. For example, one Minnesota district conducted research on the specific issues faced in their community, discovered truancy was a significant problem, and was able to implement key strategies through the A&I plans to address it. While Reimagine highlights the importance of assessing and addressing existing systemic inequities, it is also important for districts to consider which policy changes can impact their communities and develop concrete, evidence-based practices around how those changes will be developed and implemented.

Implementing Reimagine

- **Align strategies of Reimagine with A&I legislation:** There are many aspects of Reimagine that align with the A&I plan. Indeed, portions of the A&I plan analysis suggest not just the context of current policy, but also how the Reimagine Roadmap may be implemented through it. We suggest evaluating how Reimagine’s strategies may be inserted into the A&I legislation. State revenue is already set aside for the goals of integration, equity, and closing the achievement gaps. Highlighting Reimagine’s strategies and advocating for them be placed within the A&I legislation make it possible to not only have Reimagine aligned into already existing legislation, but to have revenue supporting it. Doing this will coalesce the best parts of the A&I legislation and Reimagine. Therefore, there will be an opportunity to have funds dedicated to Reimagine’s strategies as well as legislation mandating their use.
- **Coach educational leaders on utilizing Reimagine within districts as well as deeper stakeholder engagement:** MDE is deepening their commitment to coaching district leaders. To build off this, there are multiple ways to utilize the relationships that already exist in order to promote and implement Reimagine. First, asserting a holistic, collaborative approach of relationship building, educating, and coaching district and MDE leaders to implement these strategies through the revenue provided by the A&I plans is a tangible possibility. Second, utilizing the relationships obtained through the development of Reimagine - district leaders, parents, teachers, students, and MDE officials - in order to develop strategic plans, outside of the revenue given through the A&I plans, may benefit Reimagine’s long-term aims. Assisting

the districts in thinking about a strategic process of analyzing their unique communities, their students' needs, and what resources are available to address them as well as how Reimagine can fit into these improvements is necessary. By assisting school districts in the development of a 5-10-year plan, Reimagine can be implemented with intention. Each district has unique challenges and demographics and the need to be clear and calculated is important. Furthermore, by utilizing a collaborative approach of relationship building and coaching, there is an opportunity to bring to the table charter as well as private schools. With the right relationships, and a collaborative approach, it is possible to include those educational leaders. There is power in Reimagine's relationships. Cementing these relationships further and engaging more parents, teachers, board members, and even students will create a deeper impact.

Additional Policy Recommendations in Education & Beyond

- **Develop strategies on conventional data collection, expanding which data to collect, disaggregation, and research within current education policies, such as the A&I plans and WBWF:** Current data and collection processes make it very difficult to determine A&I program effectiveness. Reimagine is a critical tool which will help promote multicultural organizations and increase student achievement. There are several existing plans led and implemented by educational leaders which focus on closing achievement gaps. These plans correlate, in some ways, with elements in Reimagine. While we believe that Reimagine will make an impact, it is impossible to know which interventions would be successful and to what degree without proper data collection. This lack of clarity will continue without a fundamental understanding of key indicators of progress, disaggregation of data by race, more standardized ways of collecting and reporting, and research into best practices. Doing this will lead to a clearer idea of what will work, why, how, to what degree, and how best to replicate it through more systems. However, even while collecting and disaggregating conventional data, it is important to note that there may be other qualitative measures which should be taken into account when measuring the success of our educational system.
- **Consider re-allocating funds within A&I plans to programs that have proven to be effective:** There are many programs developed to address disparities in outcomes and A&I revenue is used in many ways across school districts. Not all of them are working. It is important to understand which practices, policies, and strategies are working for integration and school achievement and scrupulously invest in those programs that are making an impact. As mentioned previously, it is also important to address the way that data is collected. The next step is utilizing that data to understand what contributes to the gains in student achievement. Expenditure totals of A&I plans follow prescribed limits (see pg 15), but there is no mention of a thorough examination of all the policies within A&I plans to see what is working and what is not. Therefore, we suggest the examination of all policies within a plan and the reallocation funds to those programs that have proven to be effective in order to most efficiently close achievement gaps.

- **Implement a more collaborative framework for addressing education and segregation:** As has been outlined in historical context section of our analysis, it is incomplete to consider segregation or disparities in access and outcomes without also considering other policies that have led to segregation. There are key questions to consider. For instance: should these policies be localized within schools, or should we be mutually accountable for policies that cut across public service delivery? While there is a complex web of policies that exist to reassert segregation within the Twin Cities area, and it will be important to consider all of them to make a full impact, the broad categories leading toward segregation in the Twin Cities metro include: 1) housing, 2) transportation, and 3) economic development. We suggest making a concerted effort to consider the other underlying policies and behaviors which have led to segregation. Considering these larger policy areas increases the possibility of tackling disparities amongst all people. Indeed, it is our conclusion that one cannot talk about educational disparities without also talking about housing, economic development, jobs, and transportation.
- **Encourage the courts to consider social science research in decisions around education and integration.** The history above demonstrates that judicial rulings have the ability to transform educational policies and inform how policy-making bodies view segregation and achievement. Although court decisions regarding segregated schools have been ambiguous, leaving advocates of education equity constrained, there is one point in history that we need to revisit. The third case in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1992) acknowledged that the legal effects of legal segregation would not magically disappear. The court noted that, “the court does not permit the court to ignore today’s reality...” (*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 1992), and in multiple of the *Brown* cases the court found that segregation had detrimental effects on students of color after reading sociological and psychological reports of black students (Thompson Dorsey, 2013). After ruminating on the importance of education on the full development of students, the courts should continue to consider social science research on the importance of segregation and its ability as a judicial power to enforce and be explicit in its mandates of integration policy. This will lead to a more holistic approach to addressing issues of segregation and achievement.

Further Research

Throughout this research and analysis, several larger questions about the framing of equity and how programs have been designed around student achievement and integration persist. It is impossible to examine efforts at integration around Minnesota and not notice trends that point to some troubling assumptions around the programs that have been developed. This team identified some of those larger concerns as:

1. The inherent assumption of Minnesota’s Achievement and Integration plans is that integration will necessarily lead to greater achievement for all students. Are integration

and achievement inextricably linked? Could it be that the problem is not just physical segregation, but the segregation of cultural ideologies?

2. MDE identifies certain schools as “racially identified” and mandates that districts design programs to integrate those schools. However, white schools not “racially identified” even when they contain a supermajority of white students. Is integration only a concern when the school is predominantly students of color? What does it really mean to “integrate,” and why is the focus on integrating students of color?
3. The framework of A&I plans is mandated by the state to exist within Minnesota’s WBWF framing. What does this framing say about how we perceive the state’s role in educating students? What does this mean for educational outcomes?
4. Student achievement and segregation don’t exist in a vacuum. What are some of the other systemic inequities that persist in promoting segregation? How can schools address or at least consider in their actions the forces that act on students outside school bounds? Are there other policy areas or partnerships into which schools must step in order to truly attain an equitable education for students?
5. What are best practices for data collection and evaluation methods across the United States? What are effective ways to evaluate integration plans? And are there other non-quantitative outcomes and goals that should be considered when evaluating educational systems to promote more holistic experiences?
6. These recommendations acknowledge certain responsibilities for the state and for each district. What, then, is the role of MDE vs. the school districts in education? How do we effectively address the tension between local control in education, integration, equity, and statewide access to “adequate education”?

These are essential questions which frame the conversation around equity. Though complex, the answers and responses to these questions have the potential to transform how we perceive “equity” and how we structure our educational systems to attain it.

Conclusion

While there are persistent racial inequities in Minnesota’s educational system, there are many efforts being made to address these gaps at a state and local level. In order to make the Reimagine initiative more effective, the above steps will lend clarity to the roadmap moving forward and help it reach its goal of educational equity throughout Minnesota.

Appendix A

As identified by Myron Orfield (2015), this series of governmental actions and policies have had the effective of creating and perpetuating regional segregation:

- The abandonment of a Metropolitan Council Housing Plan which enforced the legal requirement that all cities build a “fair share” of moderate- and low-income housing.
- A revision of the state’s school desegregation rule to allow intentionally racially segregated schools to persist indefinitely without penalty.
- The exemption of charter schools and the open enrollment system from the school desegregation rule, undermining local districts’ ability to pursue integrated education.
- Consistently increasing affordable housing goals for the diverse central cities, and the concomitant decrease of the same goals for affluent, majority-white suburbs.
- The rise of massive public-private interaction in the affordable housing industry, such as the Corridors of Opportunity group, which sought to place nearly half the region’s new subsidized housing – 4,500 units – in segregated areas along the Cities’ newest light rail line.
- The failure to consider the impact of affordable housing and education policies on older, first-ring suburbs, where segregation and concentrated poverty are growing rapidly, endangering municipalities’ financial stability and, consequently, their ability to provide basic services to residents.

Appendix B

Goal/Intervention Category	Anoka-Hennepin (AH)	AH Key Indicator of Progress (KIP)	Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS)	MPS KIP
Achievement/ Integration Goals				
	ACHIEVEMENT: MCA reading proficiency gap decrease	MCA reading proficiency gap between students of color and white students will decrease by 7.8% by 2017	ACHIEVEMENT: MCA proficiency percentages in math and reading will increase for all students	
	ACHIEVEMENT: MCA reading proficiency gap decrease	MCA reading proficiency gap between students qualifying for economic assistance and those that do not will decrease by 9.4%	ACHIEVEMENT: MCA score gaps on reading and math between white and nonwhite student groups will be reduced by half	
	INTEGRATION: Sustain enrollment in magnet programs		INTEGRATION: Maintain current levels of enrollment (500 students) in downtown FAIR School	
Teaching and Teacher Interventions				
	Training teachers and administrators in culturally responsive methods and family engagement techniques	Q Comp Evaluations; Classroom Walk-throughs; Teacher Performance Appraisal System; Participant surveys	Minneapolis Ethnic Studies	Teacher surveys, reflective meetings, and program report from educational partners
	Training teachers and administrators, specifically student achievement advisors	Teachers and staff will report feeling more confident addressing cultural conflicts and use more resources from the Multicultural Resource Center	Equity Initiatives Professional Development (site-based coaching)	Develop district model for Equity Professional Development; identify outside opportunities; conduct annual surveys
	Recruit and retain racially and ethnically diverse staff	Increase percentage of staff of color by .9%	Grown Your Own (diversifying teaching groups)	Report successful coursework; teachers surveys; evidence of student growth in achievement and engagement; increased diversity of teaching force
			Interdistrict professional development (narrowing achievement gap, cultural training)	Communicate opportunities; follow up on impact with survey; participate in Regional Equity Partners training planning
			Equity Initiatives Conferences	Communicate opportunities; follow up with survey
Student and Family Support Interventions				
	Integrated Learning Environments / Increase cultural fluency and competence	Weekly services reports and Personal Learning Plans will track student academic growth and progress		
	College/career readiness/increased participation in rigorous programs by underserved students (AVID)	Number of students enrolled will increase or be maintained; more participation from students of color		
	Family engagement programs	Number of parents participating in family engagement activities will increase; survey will indicate positive perception of school		
	College and career readiness/increased participation in rigorous programs by underserved students (IB)	Number of students enrolled will increase or be maintained; more participation from students of color		
	College and Career readiness for underserved students / Increased participation in rigorous programs by underrepresented students or students enrolled in Area Learning Centers	Number of underrepresented students enrolled in advanced courses will increase		
School Choice Interventions				
	Pre-K to Grade 12 Enrollment Choices / Innovative programs that will increase racial and economic integration within the targeted school or district	K-12 magnet programming enrollment is increased or maintained; new magnet schools will be added; surveys and site visits; number of students in STEM fairs; national awards will be recorded; parent surveys will measure program support and satisfaction	Interdistrict magnet FAIR school (schools with integration lens)	Number of students participating in FAIR schools; number of students from Collaborative Member Districts participating in FAIR schools
	Integrated Learning Environment / Increased cultural fluency, competency, and interaction via cross district programs	Collect data on participants and program success		
Other Interventions				
	Research-based interventions by specialists	MCA reading and math proficiency gaps will decrease		

Goal/Intervention Category	Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan (RAVE)	RAVE KIP	St. Paul Public Schools (SPPS)	SPPS KIP
Achievement/ Integration Goals				
	ACHIEVEMENT: MCA reading proficiency increases will decrease the gap between American Indian/ Native American and white students		ACHIEVEMENT: MCA reading proficiency percentages will increase for all students	Number of students proficient on MCA reading will increase by 12 percentage pts
	ACHIEVEMENT: MCA reading proficiency increases will decrease the gap between Hispanic and white students		ACHIEVEMENT: MCA reading proficiency gap between white students and students of color will decrease	Gap in MCA reading scores will decrease by a certain percentage according to student demographic group
	ACHIEVEMENT: MCA reading proficiency increases will decrease gap between Black & white students		ACHIEVEMENT: MCA math proficiency percentages will increase (All students)	Number of students proficient on MCA reading will increase by 12 percentage pts
	INTEGRATION: Increase racial balance		ACHIEVEMENT: MCA math proficiency gap between white students and student of color will decrease	Gap in MCA math scores will decrease by a certain percentage according to student demographic group
Teaching and Teacher Interventions				
	Train teachers and administrators to be more culturally responsive	All staff will participate in a minimum of one session from 2014 to 2016	Train teachers and administrators on racial equity and culturally responsive learning environments	Number of staff receiving training will increase each year
	Recruitment and retention of racially and ethnically diverse staff	Develop a Grow Your Own teacher program by 2017	Teacher/administrator AVID training with EMID districts	10-12 teachers participate each year
Student and Family Support Interventions				
	Family Engagement Program and Cultural Family Advocates	A minimum of 4 district wide events will be held; A minimum of 8 family events will take place	Family Engagement Program	Number of students proficient on MCA math will increase by 12 percentage pts
	Integrated Learning Environment - Develop student leadership groups	Develop groups in 5 schools (specifically identified in plan) by 2017	Research based intervention - AVID	Graduation rates for students of color will increase by a certain percentage according to student demographic group
	Integrated Learning Environment - Summer Bridge program across districts	100% of enrolled students will deepen knowledge and have access to advanced courses	Integrated Learning Environments - AVID college visits & park event	SPPS AVID classrooms will participate in Classroom Partnerships program
	College career readiness for underserved students (AVID)	Number of students in focus groups enrolled in advanced courses will increase by 10% from 2014 to 2017	College career readiness for underserved students	Graduation rates for students of color will increase by a certain percentage according to student demographic group
			Integrated Learning Environments - Interdistrict Classroom partnerships	Number of students participating in CPP will increase by 25% each year
			Integrated Learning Environments - EMID Programs	Number of students proficient on MCA reading will increase by 12 percentage pts
			Integrated Learning Environments - college career readiness	Increase number of staff served by Multicultural Resource Center events to 600 annually
			Integrated Learning Environments - Lovin' the Skin I'm In	Number of students proficient on MCA reading will increase by 12 percentage pts
School Choice Interventions				
	Integrated Learning Environments - staff support, increasing partnerships, possibly additional magnet schools	Written needs and assets assessment; professional development plan with evaluation data	Integrated Learning Environments - Magnet schools	Number of students proficient on MCA reading will increase by 12 percentage pts
	Pre-K to Grade 12 enrollment choices (through use of magnet schools)	Number of students in focus groups enrolled in advanced courses will increase by 10%	Integrated Learning Environments: American Indian Magnet schools	Academic achievement of AI students in MCA reading will increase by 12 pts
			Pre-K to Grade 12 Enrollment choices: transportation	90% of RSP seats will go to RSP eligible students
Other Interventions			Pre-K to Grade 12 Enrollment choices: student placement	Participate in 250 engagement events at the Student Placement Center

References

- Achievement and Integration in Minnesota, Minn. Stat. §124D.861 (2013).
- Anoka Hennepin School District. (2018, April). Retrieved from: <https://www.ahschools.us/>
- Anoka Hennepin. (2014, March). *Achievement and integration plan: July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2017*. Retrieved from <https://www.ahschools.us/cms/lib08/MN01909485/Centricity/domain/6497/achievement%20and%20integration/AIM%20plan.pdf>
- Association of Metropolitan School Districts (AMSD). (2017, December). Reimagine Minnesota Roadmap. Retrieved from: <http://www.amsd.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Reimagine-MN-Roadmap-for-Action.pdf>.
- Belk v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board. of Education, 269 F.3d 305 (4th Cir. 2001).
- Board of Education of Oklahoma City v. Dowell, 498 U.S. 237 (1991).
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Brown II, 349 U.S. 294 (1955).
- Britannica. (2018, April). *Definition of Neoliberalism*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/neoliberalism>.
- Census Bureau. (2010). Retrieved from: <https://www.census.gov/2010census/data/>
- Capacchione v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 80 F. Supp. 2d 557 (W.D.N.C. 1999).
- City of Minneapolis. (2018, April 2018). Retrieved from: <http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/>
- Cruz-Guzman v. State, 892 N.W.2d 533 (Minn. App. 2017) (review granted Apr. 26, 2017).
- Dumas, J.M., Dixon. D.A., & Mayorga, E. (2015). Educational policy and the cultural politics of race: Introduction to the special issue. *SAGE Journals*, 30(1). Retrieved from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0895904815616488>

Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

Freeman v. Pitts (89-1290), 498 U.S. 1081 (1992).

Frohlich, T. C. (2015, January 15). States with the best schools. Retrieved from:

<https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2015/01/15/247-wall-st-states-best-schools/21388041/>

Magan, Christopher. (2017, February 3). Do Minnesota schools need more money or reforms?

Pioneer Press. Retrieved from: <http://www.twincities.com/2017/02/03/dayton-wants-900-million-more-for-education-will-he-get-it/>

McGuire, K. (2014, August 19). Generation Next pushes ambitious plan to reduce achievement

gap. Retrieved from: <http://www.startribune.com/generation-next-pushes-ambitious-plan-to-reduce-achievement-gap/271720461/#>

Minneapolis Public Schools. (2015). *2015-2017 Achievement and integration plan*. Retrived

from http://www.mpls.k12.mn.us/uploads/amended_fy15-17_mpls_ai_plan10_21_15.pdf

Minnesota Department of Education. (2018, April). Achievement and Integration Plan. Retrieved

from: <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/acint/>

Minnesota Department of Education. (2018, April). Minnesota Report Card. Retrieved from:

<https://rc.education.state.mn.us/>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Achievement gap: How black and white*

students in public schools perform in mathematics and reading on the National

Assessment of Educational Progress. Washington, DC.

National Education Association. (2018, April). *Equity Definition*. <http://www.nea.org/>.

- Orfield, M. (2015, February). Why are the Twin Cities so segregated?. Retrieved from:
<https://www.minnpost.com/sites/default/files/attachments/WhyAretheTwinCitiesSoSegregated22615.pdf>
- Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- Raghavendran, B., & Dupuy, B. (2017, February 24). Minnesota high school graduation rates show narrowing achievement gap. Retrieved from:
<http://www.startribune.com/minnesota-high-school-graduation-rates-show-narrowing-achievement-gap/414629153/#1>
- Rosemount - Apple Valley - Eagan. (2014). *Achievement and integration plan: July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2017*. Retrieved from
<http://public.district196.org/District/AdvisoryCouncils/IntegrationPlan.pdf>
- Saint Paul Public Schools. (2016, August). *Achievement and integration plan: July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2017*. Retrieved from
<https://www.spps.org/cms/lib/MN01910242/Centricity/Domain/146/SPPS%20Ach%20and%20Integration%20Plan%208-15-16%20REVISED.pdf>
- Scott, J., & Rand, Q. (2014). The politics of education in the post-*Brown* era: Race, markets, and the struggle for equitable schooling. *SAGE Journals*, 50(5). Retrieved from
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013161X14551983?journalCode=eaqa>
- Taylor, E. (2006, August 18). A critical race analysis of the achievement gap in the United States: Politics, reality, and hope. *Leadership & Policy in Schools*, 5(1). Retrieved from
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15700760500499025>

Thompson Dorsey, N.D. (2013). Segregation 2.0: The new generation of school segregation in the 21st century. *SAGE Journals*, 45(5). Retrieved from

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013124513486287?journalCode=eusa>

Title VI, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d et seq. (1964).

U.S. Census Bureau (2016). *American Community Survey 1-year estimates*. Retrieved from:

<https://censusreporter.org/profiles/97000US2732390-rosemountapple-valleyeagen-mn/>

Verges, J. (2015, December 17). Lawsuit accuses metro schools of failing minorities. Retrieved

from: <https://www.twincities.com/2015/11/04/lawsuit-accuses-metro-schools-of-failing-minorities/>

World's Best Workforce, Minn. Stat. § 120B.11 (2013).